

**REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging receipt of Applicant's foreign priority document that was submitted pursuant to 35 USC section 119. Applicant has modified claim 6 in order to overcome the Examiner's rejection of claim 6 under 35 USC section 112, second paragraph. Applicant submits that modified claim 6 comports with all of the requirements of section 112 and accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner now withdraw this rejection of claim 6.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the prior art rejections set forth by the Examiner under 35 USC sections 102 and 103. Applicant respectfully submits the prior art references of record, whether considered alone, or in combination, fail to either teach or suggest Applicant's presently claimed invention. More specifically, Applicant's claimed invention is directed to new and improved photolithographic techniques wherein a correction grid is initially established and then a correction cable is utilized in order to more accurately effect the generation of photolithographic structures.

In accordance with an exemplary embodiment of the invention, both a correction grid and correction table are utilized in the improved systems and methods of the present invention. This is now clearly set forth in newly submitted claims 9 and 10. Additionally, one of the advantageous techniques that are described and claimed in the instant application is directed to the modification of the mask correction units based upon a comparison between the existing mask correction units and actual structures that are manufactured during the photolithographic process. As specified in some of the dependant claims, depending upon

page 6 of 9

whether the variation between the actual structures and the mask correction units, the mask correction units are further modified only if the variation is greater than the specified amount.

Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art references of record fail to teach or suggest any of these aspects of the subject matter described in the instant application. More specifically, Applicant notes that the Chen reference, United States patent number 5,707,765 is merely directed to a photolithographic technique wherein serifs are utilized to increase the correspondence between actual circuit design and the final circuit pattern on a semiconductor wafer. The size of the correction is determined by the resolution of the optical exposure tool used during fabrication and the correction regions are positioned only on the corner regions of the mask.

There is simply no teaching or suggestion whatsoever regarding Applicant's claimed numeric correction of the mask correction units. Furthermore, Applicant notes that the Nakajima reference United States patent number 5,895,736 is merely directed to an electron beam lithographic system that radiates an electron beam through apertures formed in an aperture plate. Nakajima similarly fails to teach or suggest the correction techniques specified and claimed the instant application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner now withdraw the prior art rejections and allow all claims in the application.

Appl. No. 09/982,305  
Amdt. Dated May 5, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of November 5, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 5, 2004

(Reg. #37,607)

Robert J. Depke  
**HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLC**  
131 S. Dearborn, 30<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
Tel: (312) 263-3600  
**Attorney for Applicant**

Appl. No. 09/982,305  
Amdt. Dated May 5, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of November 5, 2003

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States  
Postal Service as First Class Mail on May 5, 2004 in an envelope addressed to:

**Mail Stop -Fee Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450**



Attorney for Applicants